

REMARKS

New claims 24 and 25 have been added. Claims 1 and 3-25 are pending, with claims 1, 14, and 18 being independent. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

Request for Interview

As an initial matter, it is noted that once again the Examiner's explanations of the rejections are merely copies of the claims into which the Examiner has inserted portions of the references that the Examiner considers to disclose the claimed features. However, the Examiner has not explained why she considers the portions of the references to disclose the claimed features, which makes it impossible for the applicants to respond to the rejections without speculating about how the Examiner is interpreting the references, thereby creating the potential to prolong the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, it would be very helpful if the Examiner would provide more detailed explanations of the rejections with a view toward expediting the prosecution of the application in light of the fact that the Office Action of September 21, 2007, is the fourth Office Action that has been issued in the application.

Also, the Examiner has continually changed her position with respect to the same reference during the prosecution of the application. For example, in the four Office Actions that have been issued, that Examiner has identified four different portions or combinations of portions of Tsumagari that the Examiner considers to disclose the feature recited in claim 17. This constitutes piecemeal examination, which should be avoided as much as possible pursuant to MPEP 707.07(g).

During a telephone conversation on October 29, 2007, the undersigned attorney discussed the Examiner's explanations of the rejections with the Examiner's supervisor, SPE John R. Cottingham, who suggested that it might be advisable for the attorney to conduct an interview with the Examiner to resolve any differences in interpretations of the references in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule an interview prior to issuing another Office Action. The attorney also left a voice mail message for the Examiner on December 21, 2007, requesting an interview.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 18-22 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Murase et al. (Murase) (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,747). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is submitted that Murase does not disclose "[a] method of reproducing audio-visual data in an interactive mode supported by interactive data associated with the audio-visual data" as recited in independent claim 18 because Murase does not disclose an interactive mode or any interactive data as recited in claim 18. It is noted that the Examiner did not specifically point out where Murase allegedly discloses an interactive mode as recited in claim 18, and did not specifically identify which of the many types of data disclosed in Murase allegedly corresponds to the interactive data recited in claim 18, which makes it impossible for the applicants to respond to the rejection without speculating about how the Examiner is interpreting Murase. Accordingly, should the Examiner repeat the rejection, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner clarify the explanation of the rejection with respect to these points.

Murase discloses reproducing audio-visual data comprising a video stream and an audio stream containing a first audio channel that may be in a first language, such as English, and a second audio channel that may be in a second language, such as Japanese. See column 5, lines 52-59, and column 14, lines 40-42, of Murase. A Preference Flag indicating which language the user prefers is stored in an audio stream attribute A_ATR0/1 as shown in FIG. 13 of Murase. The audio stream attribute A_ATR0/1 is stored in movie VOB stream information M_VOB_STI as shown in FIG. 12 of Murase, which is stored in a movie AV file information table M_AVFIT as shown in FIG. 12 of Murase, which is stored in a management information file RTR.IFO as shown in FIG. 5 of Murase, which is stored in a DVD_RTR directory as shown in FIG. 1 of Murase, which is directly below the root directory of a DVD-RAM disc as shown in FIG. 1 of Murase and described in column 9, line 61, through column 10, line 18, of Murase.

It appears from step #28 in FIG. 48, column 28, lines 20-27, and column 28, line 59, through column 29, line 6, of Murase that the management information file RTR.IFO is read when the DVD-RAM disc is inserted into a disc player and is used to generate and display a program list screen as shown in FIG. 50 of Murase. As shown in FIG. 50 of Murase, the program list screen displays the number and type of audio streams for each program, and indicates which audio stream the user prefers based on the Preference Flag shown in FIG. 13 of Murase. The user then selects one of the programs displayed on the program list screen shown in FIG. 50 of

Murase using the user interface 7801 in FIG. 40 of Murase as shown in step #29 in FIG. 48 of Murase and described in column 29, lines 7 and 8, of Murase. Then, the selected program is reproduced as shown in step #30 in FIG. 48 of Murase and described in column 29, lines 9-11, of Murase. During the reproduction of the selected program, the audio channel preferred by the user is automatically reproduced in a normal, non-interactive mode if the user has set a preference, or audio channel 1 is automatically reproduced by default in a normal, non-interactive mode if the user has not set a preference, without any input from the user as shown in FIG. 49 of Murase and described, for example, in column 7, lines 10-18, column 29, lines 34-48, and column 30, lines 36-43, of Murase. Thus, there is no interactivity of any kind during the reproduction of Murase's audio-video data, such that Murase does not disclose an interactive mode or any interactive data as recited in claim 18.

It is submitted that Murase does not disclose "interactive data comprising a plurality of interactive data respectively corresponding to a plurality of different natural languages" as recited in claim 18 because the only things in Murase that are in different languages are the two audio channels that may be in different languages, such as English and Japanese, and these audio channels are part of AV data as recited in claim 18, and are reproduced automatically in a normal, non-interactive mode without any input from the user.

It is submitted that Murase does not disclose "reading language information specifying the plurality of different natural languages of the plurality of interactive data" as recited in claim 18. The Preference Flag shown in FIG. 13 of Murase merely indicates which one of the audio channels is preferred, and does not specify the language of the preferred audio channel. Column 31, lines 2-4, of Murase states that "[o]ther possible Application Flag values include information indicating whether audio in a particular language is recorded." However, such a Application Flag value would appear to specify only one natural language, rather than a plurality of natural languages as recited in claim 18. In any event, as discussed above, Murase's audio channels that may be in different languages are not interactive data as recited in claim 18.

It is submitted that Murase does not disclose "reading one of the plurality of interactive data corresponding to a selected one of the plurality of different natural languages specified by the read language information" as recited in claim 18. The Examiner considers this feature to be disclosed in column 5, lines 52-59, of Murase, which reads as follows:

AV stream 2 in FIG. 42(b) similarly comprises one audio stream for the same video stream, but the audio stream in this case comprises two channels, i.e., main and sub audio channels. In this case the audio stream contains two selectively reproducible audio channels, a first audio channel containing the main audio (such as a first language), and a second audio channel containing the auxiliary audio data of the sub channel (such as a second language).

The Examiner apparently considers the audio channels in two different languages referred to be in this passage of Murase to be "interactive data" as recited in claim 18. However, as discussed above, these audio channels are part of AV data as recited in claim 18, and are reproduced automatically in a normal, non-interactive mode without any input from the user.

It is submitted that Murase does not disclose "interpreting and executing the read one of the plurality of interactive data" as recited in claim 18. The Examiner considers this feature to be disclosed in column 4, lines 13-19, of Murase, which reads as follows:

When the time indicated by the STC 51 and the SCR written to the pack header match, the pack is input to the demultiplexer 52. The demultiplexer 52 then interprets the stream ID in the packet header, and passes the audio stream and video stream contained in the payload data to the appropriate decoder buffers. The PTS and DTS are also read from the packet header.

This is the only place that "interpret" or any of its forms appears in Murase. The stream ID that is interpreted by the multiplexer 52 is shown in FIG. 37 of Murase, and identifies the data stored in a packet consisting of a packet header 42 and a payload 43 as shown in FIG. 37 of Murase, which may contain audio data, which may be in a particular language. However, it is submitted that the stream ID and any audio data contained in the payload 43 are not interactive data as recited in claim 18, and are not executed as recited in claim 18 as the term "executed" would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. It is submitted that decoding an audio stream as implied in this passage of Murase is not executing an audio stream as the term "executing" would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 18-22 (i.e., claim 18 discussed above and claims 19-22 depending therefrom) under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Murase be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

Rejection 1

Claims 1, 5, 6, and 23 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murase in view of Hirayama et al. (Hirayama) (U.S. Patent No. 5,652,824). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

The Examiner considers Murase to disclose "[a] reproducing method reproducing AV data in an interactive mode using a reproducing apparatus" and "reading language information indicating a language used with contents contained in interactive data" as recited in independent claim 1. However, it is submitted that Murase and Hirayama do not disclose or suggest these features of claim 1 as alleged by the Examiner because, as discussed above in connection with claim 18, Murase does not disclose an interactive mode or any interactive data as recited in claim 1. It is noted that the Examiner did not specifically point out where Murase allegedly discloses an interactive mode as recited in claim 1, and did not specifically identify which of the many types of data disclosed in Murase allegedly corresponds to the interactive data recited in claim 11, which makes it impossible for the applicants to respond to the rejection without speculating about how the Examiner is interpreting Murase. Accordingly, should the Examiner repeat the rejection, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner clarify the explanation of the rejection with respect to these points. Nor has the Examiner relied on Hirayama to show these features of claim 1.

It is submitted that Murase and Hirayama do not disclose or suggest "reading language information indicating a language used with contents contained in interactive data" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner considers Murase to disclose these features of claim 1 because the Examiner considers the Application Flag value including information indicating whether audio in a particular language is recorded on Murase's DVD-RAM disc described in column 31, lines 2 to 4, of Murase to be "language information indicating a language used with contents contained in interactive data." However, as discussed above in connection with claim 18, Murase's audio channels that may be in two different languages, such as English and Japanese, are not

"interactive data" as recited in claim 1, but are part of AV data as recited in claim 1, and are reproduced automatically in a normal, non-interactive mode without any input from the user.

It is submitted that Murase and Hirayama do not disclose or suggest "selecting and reading the interactive data made with the same language as player language information set in the reproducing apparatus with reference to the read language information" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner considers this feature of claim 1 to be disclosed in column 5, line 52-59, of Murase, which reads as follows:

AV stream 2 in FIG. 42(b) similarly comprises one audio stream for the same video stream, but the audio stream in this case comprises two channels, i.e., main and sub audio channels. In this case the audio stream contains two selectively reproducible audio channels, a first audio channel containing the main audio (such as a first language), and a second audio channel containing the auxiliary audio data of the sub channel (such as a second language).

However, as discussed above, the audio channels that may be in two different languages are not "interactive data" as recited in claim 1, but are part of AV data as recited in claim 1, and are reproduced automatically in a normal, non-interactive mode without any input from the user. Furthermore, as discussed above, the Examiner considers the Application Flag value including information indicating whether audio in a particular language is recorded on Murase's DVD-RAM disc described in column 31, lines 2 to 4, to be "read language information" as recited in claim 1. However, Murase does not disclose how this Application Flag value is to be used, and does not disclose that one of the audio channels that may be in two different languages is reproduced based on this Application Flag value. Rather, as discussed above in connection with claim 18, the audio channel preferred by the user as indicated by the Preference Flag in FIG. 13 of Murase is automatically reproduced in a normal, non-interactive mode if the user has set a preference, or audio channel 1 is automatically reproduced by default in a normal, non-interactive mode if the user has not set a preference, without any input from the user as shown in FIG. 49 of Murase and described, for example, in column 7, lines 10-18, column 29, lines 34-48, and column 30, lines 36-43, of Murase.

It is submitted that Murase and Hirayama do not disclose or suggest "interpreting and executing the read interactive data" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner considers this feature of claim 1 to be disclosed in column 4, lines 13-19, of Murase. However, it is submitted that this

portion of Murase does not disclose this feature of claim 1 for the same reasons discussed above that this portion of Murase does not disclose the similar feature of claim 18.

It is submitted that Murase and Hirayama do not disclose or suggest the feature of claim 1 "wherein the reading the language information comprises: opening a startup file first read when the interactive mode is selected; and reading the language information from the startup file." The Examiners considers this feature of claim 1 to be disclosed in Hirayama, stating as follows:

Hirayama teaches the reading the language information comprises: opening a startup file first read (i.e., read management information, See Fig. 7) when the interactive mode is selected (i.e. disk installed, See Fig. 4); and reading the language information from the startup file (i.e. Control information indicating the data arrangement of the data area and types of languages is recorded in the management area. A plurality of data units are recorded in the data area. Each data unit contains video information, and pieces of audio information including at least three pieces of language information related to the video information. Each language information piece has an audio identification data, col. 2, lines 11-21).

However, as shown in step S3 in FIG. 7 of Hirayama and described in column 11, lines 12-14, of Hirayama, the management information is first read when the user installs a disk 100 in the recording and reproduction apparatus shown in FIG. 1 of Hirayama in step S2 of FIG. 7, not "when the interactive mode is selected" as recited in claim 1. As discussed above, Murase does not disclose or suggest an "interactive mode" as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, it is submitted that Hirayama does not disclose or suggest an "interactive mode" as recited in claim 1. Rather, Hirayama discloses recording information in at least three languages and displaying information in the at least three languages to enable a user to select which one of the languages is to be used in reproducing the information. It is submitted that the Hirayama's mere selecting of a language that is to be used in reproducing information disclosed is not an "interactive mode" as recited in claim 1, and in any event, Hirayama's selecting is performed after the management information is first read in step S3 in FIG. 7 of Hirayama, not "when the interactive mode is selected" as recited in claim 1.

The only place the word "interactive" appears in Hirayama is in the following passage in column 9, lines 36-49 (emphasis added):

In the PIF, information on various elements of each program is recorded. For example, 16 bytes are used for each program. The information on various elements includes the start and end time of the program, whether the program is for home video, movie, Kara-OK, computer graphics, interactive use, game, or computer data, the identification of a speech encoding system, the identification of an image encoding system, the picture attributes, (e.g., information for identifying the aspect ratio and a system such as the PAL or the NTSC system), and information on horizontal resolution and vertical resolution. It also includes a start pointer, in which a pointer value indicating the DAT address (data unit number) is recorded within which the data unit at the program starting point is stored.

Thus, the PIF that is first read as part of the management information in step S3 of FIG. 7 of Hirayama when the disk 100 is installed in step S2 in FIG. 7 may contain information indicating an interactive use. However, Hirayama does not explain what this interactive use is, and does not disclose selecting this interactive use. In any event, it is submitted that any selecting of the interactive use could not occur before the PIF containing the information indicating this interactive use is first read, which occurs when the disk 100 is installed in step S2 in FIG. 7. Accordingly, it is submitted that Hirayama does not disclose or suggest the feature of claim 1 "wherein the reading the language information comprises: opening a startup file first read when the interactive mode is selected; and reading the language information from the startup file" as alleged by the Examiner.

Claim 23

It is submitted that Murase and Hirayama do not disclose or suggest the features "wherein the interactive data further comprises: a plurality of loading files respectively corresponding to the plurality of different natural languages of the plurality of interactive data, each of the loading files specifying an interactive data file corresponding to a respective one of the plurality of different natural languages; and a [] file [not a startup file] listing the plurality of loading files in association with the language information identifying the plurality of different natural languages of the plurality of interactive data," "wherein the reading of the language information comprises reading the [] file [not a startup file] and identifying the interactive data file corresponding to each of the plurality of different natural languages of the plurality of interactive data," and "wherein the reading of one of the plurality of interactive data comprises reading the

interactive data file identified in the reading of the language information as corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of different natural languages" recited in dependent claim 23. The Examiner considers these features of claim 23 to be disclosed in column 5, lines 52-59, of Murase, which reads as follows:

AV stream 2 in FIG. 42(b) similarly comprises one audio stream for the same video stream, but the audio stream in this case comprises two channels, i.e., main and sub audio channels. In this case the audio stream contains two selectively reproducible audio channels, a first audio channel containing the main audio (such as a first language), and a second audio channel containing the auxiliary audio data of the sub channel (such as a second language).

In fact, the Examiner repeats this passage of Murase three times in explaining the rejection of claim 23. However, the Examiner has not provided any explanation whatsoever as to why she considers this passage of Murase to disclose the numerous complex interrelated features of claim 23 discussed above. As discussed above in connection with claim 18 from which claim 23 depends, Murase's audio channels that may be in two different languages are not "interactive data" as recited in claim 18 from which claim 23 depends, but are part of AV data as recited in claim 18 from which claim 18 depends, and are reproduced automatically in a normal, non-interactive mode without any input from the user. This passage of Murase merely discloses a video stream, and an audio stream that contains two selectively reproducible audio channels. It is submitted that nothing whatsoever in this passage of Murase can reasonably be considered to correspond to the numerous complex interrelated features of claim 23 discussed above.

Conclusion—Rejection 1

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, and 23 (i.e., claims 1 and 23 discussed above and claims 5 and 6 depending from claim 1) under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murase in view of Hirayama be withdrawn.

Rejection 2

Claims 14-17 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumagari et al. (Tsumagari) (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0161615) in view of Hirayama. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14

As recognized by the Examiner, Tsumagari does not disclose or suggest "reading language information from a startup file on the optical disk" as recited in independent claim 14. However, the Examiner considers Hirayama to disclose this feature, stating as follows:

Hirayama teaches reading language information (*i.e.* *Control information indicating the data arrangement of the data area and types of languages is recorded in the management area. A plurality of data units are recorded in the data area. Each data unit contains video information, and pieces of audio information including at least three pieces of language information related to the video information. Each language information piece has an audio identification data, col. 2, lines 11-21*) from a startup file on the optical disk (*i.e.* *read management information, See Fig. 7*).

However, the "audio identification data" referred to by the Examiner that is read when the management information is read in step S3 in FIG. 7 of Hirayama when a disk is installed in Hirayama's apparatus in step S2 in FIG. 7 of Hirayama identifies audio information recorded in different languages, and is used to generate the menu shown in FIG. 5A of Hirayama, which enables a user to select which language he wants to hear. Hirayama's apparatus then reproduces the audio information in the selected language in a normal, non-interactive mode. Hirayama's audio information is not "ENAV data" as that term is understood in the art. "ENAV data" is data that is associated with corresponding audio visual data, which is consistent with the feature "reproducing the corresponding audio visual data from the optical disk together with the selected ENAV data" recited in claim 14. Thus, Hirayama does not disclose "selecting ENAV data based on the read language information" as recited in claim 14. Furthermore, it is submitted that there would have been no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Tsumagari's apparatus to provide the feature "selecting ENAV data based on the read language information" recited in claim 14. At most, Hirayama may arguably be considered to teach a way of obtaining information identifying an audio language for using in generating the DVD status

signal indicating property information such as an audio language described in paragraph [0091] of Tsumagari.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that Tsumagari and Hirayama do not disclose or suggest the combination of "reading language information from a startup file on the optical disk" and "selecting ENAV data based on the read language information" recited in claim 14.

Claim 15

It is submitted that Tsumagari and Hirayama do not disclose or suggest "comparing the read language information with a player language information stored in a system parameter table" as recited in dependent claim 15. In explaining the rejection, the Examiner states as follows:

As per claim 15, Hirayama teaches the method of claim 14, further comprising: comparing the read language information with a player language information stored in a system parameter table (i.e. For example, when the user selects #0, description code 1 appears as shown in FIG. 4B. At this time, D1 (i.e., English) is selected for speech. When the user selects #2, D2 (Japanese) is selected for speech, col. 1, lines 1-4).

However, it is submitted that nothing whatsoever in this portion of Hirayama relates to "player language information" or "a system parameter table" as recited in claim 15. Furthermore, the Examiner has not explained how the features described in this portion of Hirayama would be incorporated into Tsumagari's apparatus, or why one of ordinary skill in the art would want to do this, such that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 15.

Claim 17

It is submitted that Tsumagari and Hirayama do not disclose or suggest the feature "wherein the reproducing comprises reproducing corresponding audio visual data from the optical disk together with the selected ENAV data in a non interactive mode" recited in dependent claim 17. In explaining the rejection, the Examiner states as follows:

As per claim 17, Tsumagari teaches the method of claim 14, wherein the reproducing comprises reproducing corresponding audio visual data from the optical disk together with the selected ENAV data in a non interactive mode (*i.e. CSS parser verifies and parses CSS style sheet grammar and builds @rules and style rule sets list. CSS parser receives inline style information from XHTML parser or external CSS style sheet indicated by XHTML parser's style sheet link information. [0400]*).

However, paragraph [0400] relied on by the Examiner only describes how the CSS parser, which is apparently part of the ENAV engine 300 in FIG. 1 of Tsumagari, processes CSS, which may be an ENAV element according to paragraphs [0372]-[0379] of Tsumagari. However, it is submitted that nothing whatsoever in this passage or any other portion of Tsumagari discloses "reproducing corresponding audio visual data from the optical disk together with the selected ENAV data in a non interactive mode" as recited in claim 17.

Conclusion—Rejection 2

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 14-17 (i.e., claims 14, 15, and 17 discussed above and claim 16 depending from claim 14) under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumagari in view of Hirayama be withdrawn.

Rejection 3

Claims 3, 4, and 7-12 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murase in view of Hirayama and Tsumagari. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In explaining the rejection, the Examiner has identified various portions of Tsumagari that the Examiner considers to disclose various features recited in claims 3, 4, and 7-12 that the Examiner recognizes are not disclosed or suggested by Murase and Hirayama. However, on their face, these portions of Tsumagari appear to be completely unrelated to the features recited in claims 3, 4, and 7-12, and the Examiner has not explained why she considers these portions of Tsumagari to disclose the features recited in claims 3, 4, and 7-12. Accordingly, in the light of the Examiner's failure to provide such an explanation, it is submitted that Tsumagari does not disclose or suggest the various features of claims 3, 4, and 7-12 referred to by the Examiner.

Furthermore, claims 3, 4, and 7-12 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and it is submitted that claims 3, 4, and 7-12 are patentable over Murase, Hirayama, and Tsumagari at least for the same reasons discussed above that claim 1 is patentable over Murase and Hirayama.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 3, 4, and 7-12 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murase in view of Hirayama and Tsumagari be withdrawn.

Rejection 4

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murase in view of Hirayama, Tsumagari, and Kou (U.S. Patent No. 6,661,466). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 depends from claim 3, which depends from claim 1, and it is submitted that claim 13 is patentable over Murase, Hirayama, Tsumagari, and Sou at least for the same reasons discussed above that claim 1 is patentable over Murase and Hirayama, and that claim 3 is patentable over Murase, Hirayama, and Tsumagari.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murase in view of Hirayama, Tsumagari, and Kou be withdrawn.

Patentability of New Claims 24 and 25

It is submitted that Murase and Hirayama relied on by the Examiner in the rejection of claim 1 do not disclose or suggest the following features of new dependent claim 24 depending from claim 1:

wherein the interactive mode is a mode in which an AV picture reproduced from the AV data is embedded in an interactive picture; and

wherein the interpreting and executing comprises interpreting and executing the read interactive data to display the interactive picture in which the AV picture is embedded.

It is submitted that Murase relied on by the Examiner in the rejection of claim 18 does not disclose or suggest the following features recited in new dependent claim 25 depending from claim 18:

wherein the interactive mode is a mode in which an AV picture reproduced from the audio-visual data is embedded in an interactive picture; and

wherein the interpreting and executing comprises interpreting and executing the read one of the plurality of interactive data to display the interactive picture in which the AV picture is embedded

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that new claims 24 and 25 are patentable, and it is respectfully requested that new claims 24 and 25 be allowed.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this paper, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 12/21/07

By: 

Randall S. Svihla
Registration No. 56,273

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510